

### **REMARKS**

In this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 26 and 30-31 have been amended and claims 32-37 have been added. No new matter has been added.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 10, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertions; nevertheless, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 10 to advance prosecution. Applicants, accordingly, request withdrawal of the rejections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 10, 12, 13, 26 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaaresoja et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0177471, "Kaaresoja").

Kaaresoja fails to describe a haptic code that distinctly identifies the transmitting device and a status event. Although Kaaresoja explains that users can select tactile icons that convey meanings and suggest associations for people and between people; Kaaresoja fails to describe tactile icons that distinctly identify the transmitting device and a status event.

Furthermore, the Examiner points to the fact that Kaaresoja explains that tactile icons can be sent and received as smart messages in much the same way as ringing tones and business cards are sent and received by mobile phones..." as teaching the above limitations. In particular, the Examiner states that the "ability to send smart message much the same was as ringing tones and business cards is way to distinctly or specifically identifies the transmitter of the signal." (Office Action, Page 9) Applicants disagree. Conventionally, the ring tones that identify the

transmitter of a signal are selected by the user of the receiving device – not in the signal provided by the transmitting device. Conventionally, the phone number in the signal provided by the transmitting device is provided at the receiving device to identify the transmitting device.

Thus, the cited art fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 10 and 26. Claims 3-5, 12, 13 and 28-31 depend, directly or indirectly, from one of the foregoing independent claims. Applicants, accordingly, request withdrawal of the claim rejections.

#### New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 32-34. Kaaresoja also fails to describe each user interface member corresponding to a haptic code, as required by claims 32-34. Accordingly, Applicants submit new claims 32-34 are allowable over the cited art. Applicants submit that the new claims are fully supported by the specification and do not contain new matter.

Conclusion

At least for the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action is solicited.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 50-3557. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account. Applicants petitions for any extension of time that may be required to keep this case in force.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 13, 2009

/Suvashis Bhattacharya/  
Suvashis Bhattacharya  
Reg. No. 46,554

Nixon Peabody LLP  
200 Page Mill Rd.  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
Tel. (650) 320-7700  
Fax (650) 320-7701